TAB

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP78-03362A000500100003-0

25X1

DEVIATIONIST MOVEMENTS

As your lecture outline indicates, the discussion this afternoon is Deviationist Movements. And I hasten to explain that this is not the kind of deviationism in which Dr. Kinsey and the American public seem so involved. It's another kind, equally interesting and very practical for our purposes too. Deviationism from Communism. The Communists make a great stew about the monolithic society at which they allege to have arrived. They started talking about the monolithic society in the Soviet Union in the twenties. They've been talking about it ever since. They talk about the monolithic society in the satellites and China. Although they don't profess to have a wholly monolithic structure, they talk as though such were just around the corner. I think the next hour will indicate rather strongly that they have anything but a monolithic structure; that there has been a tradition, a history, of deviationism from the Communist line in the past, a number of examples of which we'll cite. There are current deviations from Communist doctrine and practice and we can certainly anticipate that there will be deviations in the future.

The lecture is based on the assumption that we now have a working knowledge of Communist theory and practice. (We hope that that's a valid assumption.) And we'll trace through the European socialist movement, from Marx to Malenkov, pointing out deviations in the past, and placing particular emphasis on the present. The purposes of the lecture: first, to place the growth of Communism in its traditional historical context, and particularly in its European context, (because it was a derivative of European ideas). Next, to clarify the distinction between Communism and Socialism, and more specifically, distinctions

between Soviet or Russian Communism and other kinds of Communism, because there are many kinds of Communism in the world today. In very practical terms, this means a great deal to us in the United States, especially to those of us in the Agency. It may very well occur in our peregrinations around the earth that we will meet someone who declares himself to be a Communist. The rather cursory knowledge that there are many kinds of Communists, and a more detailed knowledge as to what those Communists believe in, what they're willing to fight for, may very well indicate to us that such people, who declare themselves Communists without any further definition, may work with us. They actually may work with us because they may bear a hostility to the Soviet Union, to the Kremlin, which is more intense than their innate hostility to capitalism. And I'm sure that throughout the world there are people who label themselves Communists, members of the Fourth International for instance, Trotskyite Communists who are working for us, in one capacity or another. First, to get a few definitions under our belt: if we look to dictionaries, virtually any dictionary, to draw a distinction between Communism and socialism, it is almost impossible. The dictionary definitions just don't serve a useful purpose. Both definitions are similar. In some dictionaries they are quite identical. Actually very little distinction between socialism and Communism was drawn during the 19th century. And in some of his writings, Marx uses the terms "socialism" and "communism" interchangeably. Today, in the 20th century, because of an especial set of circumstances, we draw a very sharp line of distinction between socialism and Communism.

Now we have on the board three separate categories, as you can see: in the center - "orthodox"; to the left, "leftist"; and to the right,

"Rightist". We're going to touch on a number of people. Now certainly it isn't prudent to stuff people into pigeonholes, to say this man was orthodox, and this man was exclusively rightist, and this man was exclusively leftist; but for the practical purposes of this lecture we think we can in very general terms place people in these categories, subject to a great deal of study on your part to validate such categorizing. What we mean by orthodox is difficult to come by; some people have criticized this. I think there's a tendency amongst European students of these movements to say that what you ought to do is get a definition of orthodoxy. Of course, if you face up to the problem of tracing a movement for over a hundred years, you quickly recognize that you can't define it, because orthodoxy was one thing at one time and one place, and it's another thing at another time and at another place. I think for practical purposes we can say that during the period of the influence of Karl Marx and his successor and colleague, Frederick Engels, perhaps for the major portion of the 19th century, orthodoxy was the kind of line in theory and practice that Marx and Engels laid down. Those people who were willing to follow the directives of Karl Marx can be declared to be orthodox. However, when the movement got going and reached its fullest realization in the 1917 revolution in the Soviet Union, Lenin became the focal point of what was orthodox, and I think here we should recognize that by certain innovations that Lenin made on Marxist theory, the vanguard concept and such, he himself was a deviationist. But we shall accept for the purposes of this lecture that Lenin, during his lifespan, during the period of his great influence, certainly prior to and during World War I up until his death in 1924, represented the orthodox line of thinking. And thereafter, we again run into a

complicating factor. Because of certain innovations that Stalin made, first on Lenin's theory and practice and then in turn on Marx's theory and practice, he too might be labeled a deviationist; but again, for practical purposes, we'll label him orthodox. We shouldn't, probably, carry it any further because there's very little we know about Malenkov, as to what kind of a theory he's laying down. The waters are far too muddied at present.

Now, by leftist deviationism I think we can make a categorical statement that this will include people who are more extreme than the people who were pronouncing and following the orthodox line: people such as Rosa Luxembourg, whom we'll talk about in some detail, who wanted to go further and faster, who were unwilling to accept orders and to carry out orders from the orthodox center. By leftist deviationism we mean the people who were more extreme than those who took the orthodox line of reasoning.

By rightist deviationism we can include all those people who wanted to conserve something out of capitalistic society, who were willing to make their peace, and to do business with society as it existed, (and we'll mention several of them). Now, before we go any further: because this is basic to an explanation of where various people fit into the movements, I'd like to ask if there are any questions regarding these definitions.

Now, as far as accountability goes, because there are a great number of very influential people, and obviously in the short amount of time we have to devote to this problem, we can't expect to understand or appreciate the position of everyone, I will put the people whom we consider most important in terms of decision-making [illegible] you can

find in some detail in Carew-Hunt. They are people, if you've read Carew-Hunt, you will recognize immediately. Some of the lesser lights we will have to avoid talking about in detail, and as a consequence, you won't be held accountable for knowing where they stood in terms of this whole movement. So, a good general definition is: anybody that appears on the board, you should have a good working knowledge of where he fits into the general picture.

The origins of this movement, of course, as far as it was a movement, were pretty much in the hands of Karl Marx. Karl Marx as you know was a first-rate philosopher and a keen student of history. He read a great deal; he appreciated the significance of the industrial revolution, the cataclysmic changes that it was making at the very basis of Western Civilization. Some of his ideas he drew from Graccus Babeuf, a theoritician of the French Revolution, who advocated violence of the first order. Lots of people feel that Marx got his concept of violence from Babeuf, the idea that only through violence could you bring about the needed changes.

In Germany there were some abortive leagues formed during the '30's and '40's, but it wasn't until Marx had begun writing in some detail that a group of so-called socialists, people who wanted to meet this growing problem that industrialization had forced upon Europe, a group of readers of Marx contacted Marx in Brussels and held a meeting. The upshot was an international congress in London, and the result was the Communist League of 1847. Now the most important material that was derived from the Communist League of 1847 was, of course, the Communist Manifesto. Here the basic aim, according to Marx, was the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of a society

resting upon class antagonisms and the founding of a new society without classes and without private property. And this was a rallying call for the Communist League. The League did not last beyond 1852. There are a number of reasons why it didn't. In the first place there was increasing economic prosperity - the '40's were difficult, the '50's were more prosperous. People just tended to gravitate away from any organized movement when they ate better. Also, there were insufficient numbers of people who were formally interested in this movement, and the general feeling is that the basis was far too theoretical in scope to appeal to most working men of Europe. In any event, the Communist League of 1847 set a precedent for more important things which were to come. And the more important organization which came (in 1864) was the First International.

The First International was organized as a result of the re-awakening of the working classes. As with the Communist League of 1847, Marx was the heart and the head of the movement. Marx drafted an appeal, some of the ideas of which were inherent in the Communist Manifesto, calling for emancipation of the workers, stating that such emancipation was their own duty, since no one else was going to do it. He also declared distinctly that there needed to be an abolition of class rule. And lastly, this is very important because it was the basis of all his organizational ideas, that there was a positive need for international solidarity, that the workmen organizing in one separate country wouldn't get to first base unless they got together with their colleagues elsewhere. The basic strength in the First International came from the English trade unions. The reasons for this were several and very logical. In the first place, English trade unions were the strongest trade unions in all of Europe. And secondly, because they were strong and because they

went through a depression in 1862 and 1863, especially brought on by the American Civil War, when the importing of raw cotton from the South was pretty much reduced by the Northern blockade, working classes were beginning to feel the pinch by 1864. There were distinct economic problems in England. Such a movement, therefore, made a direct appeal to the English working classes. There were other supporters on the Continent in Belgium and France and in the Netherlands to a limited extent. The decline and fall came rather early. In 1871, there occurred the shattering Paris Commune, in which the Paris workmen took up the cudgel. It was a first-rate violent revolution. It is difficult to decide what their aims were. They wanted to better their conditions, but they never declared themselves very clearly. Actually, it is estimated that from twenty to thirty thousand people lost their lives. It was one of the bloodiest uprisings in history. Marx recognized that any such movement was bound to be a futile movement because organization and numbers hadn't reached a point where the First International could work very effectively for the working men of France. But when the leaders of the Paris Commune came to him, prior to raising this violent revolution, he suggested very strongly that they put it off until a more auspicious time. They refused and reluctantly he went along with their idea to invoke the Commune. When the Commune was drowned in a bath of blood, literally, of course the First International lost a great deal of prestige, not only amongst the upper classes but amongst the middle classes. The First International's name became associated with violence and bloodshed. As a consequence, the loss of prestige forced the leaders in the First International to move headquarters to New York in 1872, and although New York and the United States were faced with some economic problems

in the 1870's, they were virtually nothing as compared with European problems in the same area. As a consequence, the First International was finally dissolved in 1876. This, in general, is a rough tracing of the movement of the First International.

Now we've already stated that Marx was the heart and head of the First International. There were, however, some significant deviations which occurred during the First International. And the first of these we might declare to be a leftist deviation, headed by the Russian, Mikhail Bakunin. Bakunin was an anarchist who founded a movement with a special strength in Italy, Spain, and Russia, countries, by and large which were just beginning to face up to the technological problems that the British had to face up to perhaps a half a century or more earlier. Bakunin founded in 1868 the International Social Democratic Alliance. This organization was at first admitted to the International with the blessing of Marx, but later, because of Bakunin's theory and because of the practices of his groups, he and his people were expelled from the First International. Bakunin was a dynamic, dashing, rather charming fellow. He had that rare gift of personality which attracted followers. He assumed a rather histrionic way of life; he's often compared with Garibaldi. He wore spectacular clothes; he was a very imposing figure; a very big man, and quite dynamic. And he had some very startling concepts: for example, he always talked about embracing the human race, which is curiously 20th-century Marxian, it seems to me. He had a remarkable career, nevertheless. He was expelled from Russia at one point, and he claimed that he had succeeded in doubling the Czar's principle agent in Switzerland back into Russia, where he got a fount of information over a period of three or four years. His personality was almost

completely the antithesis of that of Karl Marx. Marx, the scholar, rather prudent; Bakunin, impetuous, dashing, anything but scholarly in his attitudes. His theory was essentially this: that all government is evil and that the economic activities of man should be carried on without any organization whatsoever. He wrote in God and the State, his principal work, that the liberty of man consists solely in this... "that he obeys the laws of nature because he himself has recognized them as such and not because they've been imposed upon him externally by any foreign will whatsoever, human or divine, collective or individual. We object to all legislation, all authority and all influence - privileged, patented, official, and legal - even where it has proceeded from universal sufferage, convinced that it must always turn to the profit of a dominating and exploiting minority against the interests of immense majority...." With that kind of a concept you can imagine how Karl Marx must have reacted. Of course, the heart of Marx's thinking was good organization. You can see why expulsion and a split would have to occur in terms of Marx and Bakunin.

There was another deviation which occurred specifically in Germany, during the First International. This was headed by Ferdinand Lassalle. And, I think we can be safe in saying that this was a rightist deviation. Lassalle was the founder of the General Workmen's Union, which later evolved into the Social Democratic Party of Germany. He also brought his group into the First International, but later he withdrew in the face of fire from Marx. Lassalle's background was very similar to that of Karl Marx. He was a very brilliant youngster, came from the same kind of German-Jewish stock as did Marx. As a matter of fact, he stayed with Marx in London for a long time, although they had a bitter battle raging

for a number of years. He, too, had a situation which made his position similar in a personal way to that of Bakunin. He couldn't get things done quickly enough to satisfy himself. He felt essentially that Marx was not only idealistic but irrational in assuming that you should not do business with the contemporary state, and since Germany had a capitalistic order, he felt that it was quite within his province to try to negotiate with political leaders. And Marx used to complain bitterly that Lassalle would sit across the table from the "Iron Chancellor", Bismarck, and consult with him for hours at a time, as to the position of the German laboring man, the recognition of unions, etc. As a matter of fact, Bismarck would do some complaining too, because in his own diaries he states that the thing that bothered him was that Lassalle would cover him with huge clouds of black cigar smoke for hours on end (so Bismarck would come out feeling queasy, to say the very least.). The point was that Lassalle was willing to work within the framework of the state; that was something which was anathema to Marx's way of thinking. As we said, because of this basic theoretical difference, Lassalle withdrew his people from the First International. By 1890, after the death of Lassalle, his organization had developed into the Social Democratic Party and by and large, the theoretical line was by that time orthodox. So you can certainly be safe in saying that Marx had made his mark on the German Social Democratic Party. We shall see, however, that a successor of Lassalle's, Edward Bernstein, carried on and brought the Social Democratic Party once again out of the Marxist camp. After the fall of the First International,-if you can call it a fall, it just virtually dissolved,-the socialist movement in Europe became wrapped up in the struggles in several countries, the most important of which were

England, France, and Germany. Now, there were struggles within other countries, but because of the limitations in time, we will just observe the struggle in a general way in Germany, in England, and in France.

The Second International realized its founding very similarly to the First International. It was born in the time of troubles - the '80's were very difficult economic times in Europe and you had various fairly well organized labor groups which were willing to merge into an International. However, although they were willing to merge, the merger was anything but complete, and Engels complained that in many ways the Second International was more loosely knit than the First International had been. The situation in Germany: in 1891 the SDP was declared legal. Despite Lassalle's earlier efforts, Bismarck had refused to recognize the party. But when he (Bismarck) was dropped from the chancellorship, the party was recognized as a legal one. Here certainly in the earlier '90's, it can be categorically stated that the Social Democratic Party paid allegiance to the Marxist line. But it wasn't long before a brilliant student of Lassalle's, Edward Bernstein, began to challenge that orthodoxy. Bernstein denounced dogmatic Marxism and argued as Lassalle had for a practical policy. Although Bernstein was a personal friend of Frederic Engels' and as we stated was heir-apparent of Lassalle's, he never equivocated in his criticisms. As Professor Sidney Hook, who is an authority on this subject, has said, Bernstein was one of the most intellectually honest people he had ever met. So his criticism was sincere when he criticized Marx. His criticism of Marx went generally as follows:

He stated that the collapse of capitalism was not imminent as Marx had decreed; that the whole estimation of revolutionary time-cycle was

wrong; that the opposition of the classes was not crystallizing as had been predicted; that industry was not being concentrated in all areas as had also been predicted; that there was an increasing dispersion of industry. He also argued that, contrary to Marx, the trust was actually spreading profits to greater and greater numbers of people. He questioned the logic of the government taking over thousands and thousands of industries (and that's a question which, of course, man in 1953 has to face throughout Western Europe and in this country). He also stated, again indicating his strain of practicality, that international socialism was out of the question as far as Europe was concerned. He said what European leaders ought to do was to exploit nationalistic fervors, not to try to strain in a vain attempt to work out an international which could not genuinely be an international at all. He also said that the Marxist concept of materialism ought to be severely modified; and lastly he questioned the final goal. He questioned the whole concept of the dialectic, as a matter of fact. In contrast, Bernstein suggested a democratic rather than a proletariat revolution. He said that after the revolution came, you would kick out people who were running the show, but that then you turn around and give them an equal voice with everybody else. So you'd have a genuinely democratic society. He said that violence was all right, but only where the end was clearly perceived. He wasn't against violence as such, but he said the dialectic was too obscure in regards to the use of violence. In conclusion, in justification to Marx, it must be said that most of Bernstein's criticism was directed against the earlier writings of Marx. Marx had done a considerable amount of revision in his thinking since then. In deference to Bernstein, he certainly sought to make Marx more practicable. The practical results

of Bernstein's attempt to change the Social Democratic Party of Germany, which in 1891 was orthodox, was that in 1903 Bernstein's position was voted down by the leaders of the party, Karl Kautsky and August Bebel. Yet curiously, despite this official defeat, Bernstein's position was gradually accepted and by 1914 the Social Democratic Party of Germany had become a revisionist party. Most of the members of the Social Democratic Party of Germany went to war. They refused to become members of the Third International - the Communist International. A very curious situation had developed: officially his position was voted down, but very gradually his ideas filtered through and became the theoretical basis for the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

There were in Germany at this time, also, people whom we might term radical deviationists. It's a safe bet to say that Bernstein and the Lassalle traditions represented the conservative or rightist deviationist. Perhaps the finest example of a radical deviationist was Rosa Luxembourg. Rosa Luxembourg had a rather remarkable career. She was born in Poland; she fought in the Russian revolution of 1905 at the barricades. She had very distinct ideas about Marxist theory and her own interpretation varied widely from the interpretation held by Kautsky and Bebel. She disputed the time element. Bernstein had said that the time wasn't right around the corner. But Rosa Luxembourg went to the other extreme. She said that the masses couldn't waste any more time; that they had to launch the revolution immediately. Her experiences in 1905 must have indicated that even in Russia, the revolution was not the order of the day, but nonetheless she insisted that the sooner a revolution was launched in Western Europe, the better the chance for success. As she had taken up residence in Germany, Germany became the

area in which she advocated immediate, violent revolution. Her concept was essentially that capitalism was in the state of final collapse, certainly an idea that has not been borne out by the trend of events since then. This was an idea which the orthodox Marxists of Germany denied during their own lifetime. But she had a considerable number of people who considered themselves her followers. This faction helped to split the orthodox Marxist movement further in Germany.

The situation in France during the same period was roughly similar to that which occurred in Germany, but in characteristic French fashion the lines were less sharply drawn and there were more splinter factions. We can't go into any great detail on those. We can talk in general about the major movements. The French movement was based chiefly on the philosophy of syndicalism as advocated by Georges Sorel. Syndicalism was a movement which grew up on a parallel course to that of Marxism. We put it in the left category because it was almost anti-rationalistic. Sorel, like Bakunin earlier, didn't believe in any organization whatsoever. He felt that any organization would be overthrown and put into the hands of exploiting elements. The most important tenet in his philosophy was the concept of the general strike. And it was Sorel's ideas which raised the Paris Commune of 1871. The concept of the general strike was paramount. The weaknesses were that the syndicalists eschewed politics altogether, as had Bakunin. They refused to have anything to do with any party organization. Secondly, they used no discipline; they didn't have the dialectic to raise a goal, and very often people would embark on a general strike without even knowing what their objectives were. The hard-headed French working man was lost in the great vacuum of theory.

The Marxist party got its start primarily from the activities of Jules Guesde. As a newspaper publisher and a labor leader, Guesde introduced the French working people to the ideas of Karl Marx. Consistently, at least until the outbreak of World War II, Guesde represented the orthodox position in France, but like many another orthodox theorist, Guesde broke down in the face of the nationalist strife of World War I and refused later to have anything to do with the Third International -- the Communist International. In 1900, he declared against participation in the government under any circumstances, as Marx had insisted. In 1914, he accepted a portfolio in the French wartime cabinet.

There was a man in France at this same period whose position was very similar to that of Edward Bernstein. This was Jean Jaures, whom we will declare to be a rightist deviationist. And until the outbreak of World War I in 1914 Guesde and Jaures were in violent conflict. Juares said certainly workingmen could work within the fabric of the state. They could try to win their goals through cooperation with the government. Guesde said that should not be the case. Jaures, as a former professor of philosophy at the University of Toulouse, denied the doctrine of materialism. He also denied the doctrine of violent revolution, questioning whether in any case could the end justify the means. He espoused gradualism; he said that very gradually by working unceasingly the working men could better their lot within the fabric of the state.

The results in France were curiously similar to those which had occurred in Germany. Jaures' position was voted down officially by the Marxist faction, but by 1914 they had absorbed most of his thinking, and the socialist movement in France had very generally become a gradualist

movement, an evolutionary movement rather than a revolutionary movement. The proof of this statement is evidenced by the fact that Guesde accepted a portfolio in the French wartime cabinet.

Now, the situation during the period during the Second International in Great Britain was somewhat different from that which occurred in France and Germany. Despite their residencies in Great Britain for long periods of time, neither Marx nor Engels made any appreciable appeal to the British working classes. At least they made no effective direct appeal. The appeal had to come from a British source. And one of the readers of Marx, a man named Henry Mayers Hyndman, introduced the British working people to the ideas of Marx. So for England, Hyndman became the focal point for orthodoxy. He founded the Social Democratic Federation in 1881. This was strengthened by the adherence of a number of British intellectuals such as William Morris, but William Morris left the movement rather early, and so did some of the others. The traditionally conservative British people were rather slow to adopt the ideas of Marxism. The organization which is usually credited with preserving Britain from Marxist inroads was the Fabian society, which later evolved into the present day Labour Party. The Fabians consisted of a number of people who took the gradualists' point of view - the point of view that Lassalle and Bernstein and Jaures had taken previously elsewhere. Such people as G. B. Shaw, H. G. Wells, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Graham Wallas, and later Harold Lasky and G.D.H. Cole, such people denied the idea that working men and socialists shouldn't cooperate with the state. They certainly hoped for a general election in which they could win the majority vote, but they were willing to work within the constitutional framework of the state, which was

something the Marxists never were willing to do, at least not until the 1930's. This, of course, was a very remarkable group of people. They were not only theoriticians and good ones, but they were practical politicians too. Very early in his career, Shaw used to go out on street corners and address people at rallies and meetings. He wasn't an ivory-tower theoritician. And none of the Fabians were. They were all very practical work-a-day politicians, as well as theorists. Certainly amongst socialist movements, the Fabian Party, subsequently developing into the Labour Party, was perhaps the most significant single society in all of Europe during this period.

Under the terms of the Second International we can say that internationalism actually was not working. There were deviations, both right and left, from orthodoxy, all along the line, in each of the three countries we've examined. These deviations weren't perhaps appreciated for what they were worth until World War I exploded. It must be understood that prior to 1914, virtually every good Marxist had signed an agreement to the effect that when war came, and it had been looming for at least a couple of decades, he would refuse to fight for any national power, because in so doing he would destroy the international workingmen's movement. But the shattering event which occurred in 1914 was the fact that most of these people marched off behind their respective flags as soon as the various countries had declared war on one another. The whole idea of an international workingmen's movement came abruptly to a close. This was an occurrence which really shook Lenin deeply. He had honestly believed that he would be able to maintain a pacifist international workingmen's organization. Of course these people had announced that they wouldn't go to war, because they had recognized

that in going to war they would be fighting as instruments for the perpetuation of national capitalism and imperialism. But nationalistic fervors were too strong for most people and they marched off to war, much to Lenin's chagrin.

The death knell of the large-scale break-up of international socialism on this pacifist plank was sounded by Victor Adler, who was the founder of Austrian socialism. He, like many of the others, with the notable exception of Ramsay MacDonald in Great Britain, accepted a portfolio in the Austrian wartime cabinet. (This situation and what actually happened to the socialist movement - how they had to face up to reality - is discussed very intelligently in a book by Dennis W. Brogan, the British theorist, entitled "The Price of Revolution", published in 1951.) The result of the impact of World War I and what it did to the international socialist movement, was that international socialism was divided into two sections - the anti-war section and the pro-war section. Now, by pro-war we don't mean that everybody was bellicose and militant; we simply mean that these people were willing to fight and work for their own national authority. And the pro-war segment was far more numerous in terms of members of the former international movement. In 1915, the anti-war Socialists held a conference at Zummerwald, Switzerland, and formed the Third or Communist International. The official date for the Third International is 1919, but for all practical purposes the seeds were planted in Switzerland in 1915. By 1918 and the culmination of the successful Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the Bolshevik had gained control of the Third or Communist International, and Lenin was directing its activities. By 1920, world socialism was definitely split into three segments - (1) those people who retained allegiance to the International; the people who had been willing

to cooperate with their national authority, such as the Labour Party people in Britain and members of the Social Democratic Party in Germany. (2) The second segment consisted of those groups which formed the Third International or Communist International, by 1920 under the direction of the Bolsheviks. (3) The third general segment, fairly important for a time, was those groups which were caught in the middle, between the Second International and the Third International, and called derisively by their opponents, the "Second and a Half International", and known among themselves as the "Vienna International". Now, of course, there was great vying for power amongst the groups within the Second International and the groups within the Third International, in order to win over the Second and a Half International people. And the general impression is that the Second and a Half International people could have been won over to the Third International if Lenin had been more politically discreet. But he insisted categorically on a number of steps which the members of the Vienna International would have to take in order to come into the Third International. And in so doing he alienated most of the groups within the Vienna International and pushed them over into the camp of the Socialist or Second International. By and large, most of the groups within the Second and a Half International, or Vienna International, were driven to make their peace with the groups within the Second International, and the Labor and Socialist International was founded in 1923. Thereafter you have a definitive split between revolutionary socialism and evolutionary socialism. And these people within the Labor and Socialist International became evolutionary socialists. This is a very important point because it's much easier to recognize the distinction between the two movements at this time than it was earlier. I think that there certainly was a

crystallization of theory after 1923. And there certainly had been no meeting of minds since that time. In 1930 Frederich Adler, who was a son of Victor Adler, founder of the Social Democratic Party of Austria, was asked, "Is there a possibility of unification of the Socialist and Communist Internationals?" He answered, "You are certainly aware that all the problems of the international labor movement are contained in this question and all sides cannot be answered. The final socialist aim towards which the Bolsheviks are in the last resort striving is the same as the aim of the socialists but the paths to this goal are absolutely incompatible one with another. The Bolsheviks desire to bring the proletariat under the dictatorial domination of a clique of leaders which arrogate to itself a superior insight into the course of historic-economic development. Whereas, we Socialists firmly adhere to the right of self determination of the working class." And he goes on to say that on that point they can make absolutely no compromise with the Bolsheviks. Then he continues, in terms of a bit of propaganda, to state that despite this basic difference between the two groups, many Bolsheviks were coming over to the Social International movement every day. Of course, what he had failed to admit was that it was working the other way around, too. I think before we pursue the activities of current deviationists, which for practical purposes are perhaps more interesting, we should take a ten minute break.

The Labor and Socialist International was most effective during the late '20's and early '30's, but the rise of fascism in such an important country as Germany, and also in Italy, helped to rob this movement of its power. It was powerless by 1939, and it was formally

dissolved by 1945. There have been a number of attempts since World War II to get these various socialist groups together under an international tent. The Fabians made several attempts, but in general, cooperation failed; and it has usually failed because the socialist groups within Great Britain and Scandinavia consider that they are quite different in theory and practice from the socialist groups in France and Italy. In Scandinavia and Great Britain they take an empirical approach to politics. Their strength is generally based on the trade union movement and they actually have no genuine constitutional issues with the parties on the right. In other words, when the Labour Party of Great Britain loses a general election, they're quite willing to abide by the decision and let the Conservatives assume power. (As a matter of fact, they seemed eager to do so in the face of the pressures after World War II.) In France and Italy, the parties tend to be more doctrinaire. In many respects the British consider them more irrational in their approach to politics. There is also an involvement in both of these countries with the Catholic Church. Now the British feel that they ought to avoid getting entangled in such a situation. Also you have coalition governments in France and Italy. You have had the same thing in Scandinavia too, but as far as Britain is concerned, this is a basic point of departure. In any event, any opportunity to create a genuine international movement since World War II has failed. In Germany, Austria, Belgium, and the Netherlands, religious and conservative middle class parties seem to set limits to the expansion of socialism. As a matter of fact, the general trend in the last three or four years seems to indicate that socialism is losing ground very gradually. In Eastern Europe, of course, the genuinely Socialist parties have been swallowed

by the Communist coups. Despite this fact there have been a number of attempts since World War II to create an organization which will face up to the evils of Communism. Perhaps the most successful attempt occurred in 1947 when the International Socialist Conference Committee, called in short "Comisco", was founded. It was at this 1947 meeting of Comisco that the Eastern European peoples withdrew. There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that the Communist pressure was the single greatest threat which disallowed them from cooperating with the Western parties. Now, Comisco wasn't very effective, but at that time (1947) it drew a great deal of fire from "For a Lasting Peace", and other Communist journals throughout Europe. The Kremlin aimed a great many propaganda guns at Comisco. So, if it served no other purpose in terms of an affirmative constructive approach to organizing a successful international, it at least served as a bete noire to the Communists, because it clearly indicated to them that here was an organization which denied the doctrine of violent revolution, the doctrine that the end justifies the means, and so forth. In many respects, at least from '47 to '48, the Communists seemed to be leveling as much propaganda at Comisco as they were at the more obvious targets. So such movements were certainly worth perpetuating because they served as a means to publicize the idea that many working people refuse to get involved with Communism. The general program since 1948 has been as follows: the attempts to reach agreements have been given up. They hold discussions and seminars (it sounds a little like a graduate school), they discuss a number of topics: techniques of administering nationalized industries, problem of European economic cooperation, workers' participation in industrial management, the Schuman plan, etc. Their great failure has

been to produce a detailed and coherent Socialist policy. But, as we said before, their success has been to point out the lack of the ability of the Kremlin to win over the working people of Western Europe. There have been a number of other movements between wars. There have been two distinct Green Internationals; there has been a Liberal International; and a Socialist International which has now replaced Comisco, but is very ineffectual and doesn't carry on much activity. None of these moments serves a very significant purpose in International Socialism.

The next general topic we can turn to is the situation as it has existed since 1917, with particular emphasis on the situation today: deviationism in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe. We'll talk briefly about three figures: Leon Trotsky, Nicolai Bukharin, and Marshall Tito. Trotsky, within and outside the Soviet Union; Bukharin, strictly within the Soviet Union; and Marshall Tito, outside the Soviet Union, of course. The Trotsky situation is peculiar in that Trotsky was once the Number Two man in the movement. As far as Bukharin is concerned: we've chosen Bukharin because in a sense his career is almost typical of what happened to the honest intellectuals of the early 1920's, because of their inability to follow the zigging and zagging of Stalin's orthodox line. They all finally ended up in violent disagreement with Stalin.

First taking the career of Trotsky: after November 1917, the Bolsheviks passed from revolution to political responsibility. From 1917 till late 1923, until just before his death, Lenin was able to keep the situation under his own personal control because of his brilliant leadership. But the realization grew in 1922 and 1923 that Lenin was a dying man, and the issue arose as to who was going to inherit the

mantle. And there were a number of people who were logically in line to inherit leadership of the party, and the Soviet Union. The approaches of Trotsky, Bukharin, and Stalin were generally as follows during this period of flux: Trotsky's idea was to press forward on the domestic and foreign fronts to social revolution without any time lag. Bukharin at this period of his life was quite realistic. He thought that the answers to the Soviet Union's problems should be sought within the framework of Lenin's New Economic Policy, the NEP, so called. In other words, Bukharin took pretty generally the attitudes that Lenin had laid down in order to revolutionize Russian society. Stalin's attitude was to press forward on the domestic front to social revolution, also within the framework of NEP. Here Stalin used Bukharin's approach to destroy Trotsky, because Trotsky wanted to ignite revolutions elsewhere immediately; and after he'd succeeded in using Bukharin's or Lenin's approach to destroy Trotsky, he turned around and used Trotsky's approach to destroy Bukharin. This, of course, is an oversimplification, but if you follow his theory, you can see that Stalin did change his attitudes radically between 1922 and 1930. The reasons for the conflict with Trotsky were multiple. In the first place, as we know, Trotsky had been a Menshevik for a long period of his life. He dropped out of the Menshevik faction, but he didn't join the Bolsheviks until 1917. Trotsky was a well-known figure by 1917. He was a brilliant and successful military leader. He was all these things during a time when Stalin was a virtual unknown. There was a conflict, and this, perhaps, is the most important single element on the time element of the revolution. As we've said, Trotsky stated that you ought to press forward on the domestic and the foreign fronts to revolution. What he meant was that world revolution couldn't wait, that Marxists

ought to go about igniting the international revolution as soon as possible, or otherwise they would lose everything they had gained in the course of the 1917 revolution. Stalin, much more cautious by nature, didn't agree with this. As a matter of fact, he was so violently opposed to it that it was on this ground that Trotsky was finally removed from the Central Committee. Certainly the more cautious view, at least in retrospect, has proved the more realistic view. It was obvious that Germany, for example, was not ripe for revolution in 1919. As Germany very gradually began to strengthen her economic position, it became more clear every day that violent revolution would not succeed there. From 1920 on Trotsky was in conflict with the leaders, even Lenin. It was characteristic of Trotsky to speak his mind. When Lenin lay mortally ill, in early 1924, Trotsky issued his Declaration of the 46 Oppositionists. Here he demanded true democratic centralism. He felt that decisions were reached by too few people and that the rest of the Party was presented with the fait accompli. He felt that this was alien to the theory of Marx and to good Socialist practice. Opposition flared up again on the issue of the Kulaks. Under Lenin's New Economic Policy, it was decided to adopt capitalist or quasi-capitalistic methods, and the rich and middle-class farmers were allowed to survive as such. Trotsky believed that this was a slight to the people who had suffered and died during the revolution. So he raised a hue and a cry against the continued existence of the "Kulaks". Of course, here again Stalin was faced with the practical problem of providing the Soviet Union with enough agricultural produce to let it continue to exist on a marginal basis. But this was a very real issue between the two leaders. The summer of 1926, the followers of Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev united to form an anti-Party front. By this time,

Stalin was pretty much in control. Trotsky demanded a party discussion, and the result of this demand was that he, Zinoviev, and Kamenev were expelled. He got short shrift. The argument presented against him was chiefly based on the issue of permanent revolution. (Trotsky advocating that permanent revolution be continued immediately and not delayed until some propitious day.) In 1929 Trotsky was banished from the USSR. He lived in Turkey and several other countries. He finally found refuge in Mexico, where he was assassinated in 1940. And I don't know how good my source is, but last year True Magazine came out with the "real identity" of Trotsky's assassin. He's alleged to be a Spaniard who was an important figure in the Third International, and who acted for the Third International. (I don't know how many people are familiar with the penal system in Mexico, but apparently if you're an important enough prisoner, you get a suite of rooms, a radio, and such things. So it's obvious that he's not interested in getting out, because there are dangerous people who are likely to be in the vicinity when he does get out.) Here, of course, the significance lies in the fact that Stalin refused to brook any rivalry. He did, in fact, have a system where you didn't have any democratic centralism; you had central authority eminating from him and him alone. Trotsky and his followers since his death in 1940 have continued to disturb people in the Kremlin. The Fourth International was founded in the middle thirties, with Trotsky as its head. And Trotsky, who was a prolific writer, continued to unleash a stream of propaganda aimed at the Kremlin. As a matter of fact, he was the first man of any significance in the movement to point out the threat of the National Socialists coming to power in Germany. Today the Trotskyites operate mainly through the method of penetration. They attempt to split orthodox socialist and Communist organizations. Therefore they come somewhat honestly by their

label "Wreckers". They hold world congresses from time to time under some kind of cover, even where they operate as legal parties, and some examples of Trotskyite parties today are: in France - the Party Communiste International; in Britain - the Revolutionary Communist Party of Great Britain; in Germany - the Socialists Workers' Party; and in the United States - the Socialists Workers' Party. There are others. Some of them are very weak. But again they may provide a source of people who are quite hostile to the Soviet and who are quite willing to work against the Soviet Union for their own ends.

Taking up the career of Bukharin: typical of some of the young Soviet intellectuals of 1917, he was basically a theoritician and a writer. In 1917-18 when he took part in a plot to kidnap Lenin, he might be declared to be a leftist. But although his career ran rather smoothly through 1924-25, it ran into opposition with Stalin by 1930, because he felt that the decision to liquidate the Kulaks, after they had fulfilled their mission in helping to raise the general level of productivity, was a mistake. He felt that since the Kulaks had been allowed to survive for over ten years, they ought to be allowed to grow into Socialism. This is exactly the reasoning that Stalin refused to go along with. And you know that when he finally issued his doctrine to liquidate the Kulaks, it was done over a period of years, ruthlessly and violently. Bukharin saw no need for it. In view of the fact that the Kulaks had been allowed to survive for so many years, he thought it was an utter mistake. It was on this ground that he came into violent opposition with Stalin. As a matter of fact, at one meeting of the Central Committee he quoted from a letter from Lenin. He stood up and said, "If you chase all intelligent people who are not very pliable, and

only keep the obedient idiot, then you will certainly ruin the party." This is a very effective parliamentary device, but, because Stalin seemed to be wholly devoid of a sense of humor, Bukharin was liquidated. And as far as we can judge, he was removed from the Politbureau in 1929 and tried and executed in 1938, along with I.A. Rykov. The charges were based on his connections with foreign espionage. Now on the surface this may seem wholly ridiculous, but there are several British scholars who feel that Bukharin may have gotten in touch with espionage agents from abroad, that he was seeking desperately to undermine the position of Stalin, because he believed that the whole movement had taken a wrong turn. There may be some validity for the kind of a formal accusation which was placed against him in his trial. The basic point is that any theoritician would be very likely, if he were intellectually honest, to fall into opposition with Stalin.

NUTS

Turning to Tito and the national deviation of Yugoslavia: the national deviation of Yugoslavia, as you recollect, occurred in 1948. The Cominform resolution against the Yugoslavs read, "The Yugoslav leaders have placed themselves in opposition to the Communist parties affiliated with the Cominform Bureau, have taken the path of seceding from the unified socialist front against imperialism, have taken the path of betraying the cause of international solidarity of the working people, and have taken up a position of nationalism". The seriousness with which the Kremlin views this deviation by Tito is obvious. Of course, American policy makers in '48-'49 were faced with the problem of whether the deviation was genuine or not. But I think we very quickly reached the point where we felt that just in terms of propaganda support to Tito was worthwhile. There are many evidences of the degree of seriousness with which the Kremlin viewed this deviation. In the first

place, they launched and have continued a running propaganda attack against Belgrade. And there's a good deal of evidence to indicate that they have attempted to subvert anti-Tito elements inside of Yugoslavia. As a consequence, at least for the first two or three years, Tito had to work very hard to ferret out those subversive elements who might have been working for the Kremlin. And lastly, the Soviets imposed an economic blockade against Yugoslavia, and forbade the Czechs and the Poles to trade with the Yugoslavs. Now this hurt Yugoslavia, and as a consequence, Tito had to turn to the West for aid. But there's evidence to indicate that it hurt the Czechs and Poles worse than it hurt the Yugoslavs. This, of course, did not change the policy at all, because the Soviets were not concerned with how much it hurt the Czechs and the Poles - that was incidental to punishing the Yugoslavs. The significance of the breach: this is the first important deviation outside of the USSR, and provides a hostile external base of operations over which the Soviets have no direct control. Second: Tito is a living example of the denial of the infallibility of the Kremlin. Third, and this is very important, and for a long time widely ignored, Tito has pointed up a heretofore widely ignored aspect -- Russian nationalism in conflict with some other kind of nationalism. Fourth: this break with the Kremlin has forced Russian policy makers to get tough with leaders throughout the satellite nations, for fear that such a thing as Tito's deviation will occur again. The result has been for all practical purposes, the displacement of the able people that Bukharin talked about by tools of the Kremlin.

And there have been a whole series of replacements , which are still going on. Traicho Kostov, in Bulgaria, was read out of the Communist party [illegible] charges were disputing the exchange value

of the ruple. In Czechoslovakia, Vladimir Clementis and Rudolf Slansky, the latter being the Secretary-General of the Czech Communist Party, were read out, probably for indicating that they were still Czechs to a certain extent. In Poland, Vladislaw Gomulka, the charge against whom was that he had adopted gradualist policies. In Hungary: Laslo Rajk, for taking up a position of nationalism. In Rumania: Georgescu, Minister of the Interior, and Anna Pauker. What was very difficult to understand in her situation was that it's hard to imagine a Communist official in any of the satellite countries who was more loyal to Stalin and the Kremlin than was Anna Pauker. In Sweden: Set Persson, accused of deviationism and a policy, "more independent." Again and again you have the bug-bear,"nationalism". He was acting more as a Swede than as a tool of the Kremlin. In Italy you had a situation which developed during a period in which the Italian Communist Party was undergoing a severe shakedown. Apparently there is a large-scale movement of deviationists in Northern Italy. Although they don't profess to owe any allegiance to Tito and to Yugoslavia, their's is a nationalist movement patterned on Tito's. In France: Andre Marty and Charles Tillon, people who seemed particularly loyal. There have been many reasons advanced as to why they were removed from power. The fact that Marty was associated with the International Brigade in the Spanish Civil War as a political Commissar, (that in the face of an apparent soft policy) the Kremlin has to get rid of the old leaders. But regardless of why they have had to get rid of so many capable people in the last three and four years, the truth of the matter is that they've continued to purge and purge and purge. And the charge that Lenin originally mouthed, and that Bukharin subsequently took up in his meeting of the Central Committee seems to be a very true one.

They're obviously afraid that, even before a man does show any tendency towards becoming a national deviationist, he must be rooted out. And if he is a capable man and has an imagination, he's very likely to lose his position in the structure. There was a very interesting article in the "New York Times" about six months ago on why they purge by Edward Cranshaw. He felt that they have to purge; it's an integral part of their system, and he gives some very convincing arguments as to the necessity of continued purging. Certainly Stalin was willing to sacrifice even some of his closest personal adherents, such as Anna Pauker. Despite the charges leveled against her, she certainly evidenced a continuing loyalty to Stalin and the Kremlin over a long period of time.

That in general is the situation as it developed along nationalist lines. We can certainly see that there are many indications that you don't have a tight entity which you might label "International Communism". There is nothing like that. Whenever we reach a situation where people get very pessimistic about our ability to sit down with the British and the French and work out political and economic problems, and the Communists keep singing the song of Unity, I think if we look into the picture a little bit we can see that they are faced with as many problems as we. Of course they have a very definite advantage in being able to put physical pressure against their opponents. But they're anything but unified and monolithic in structure.

This has been an attempt to trace through the general socialist movement, specifically differentiating between Communism and socialism. We have attempted to draw a line between socialism, an evolutionary doctrine and practice on one hand, and Communism, a revolutionary doctrine and practice on the other. And we've also tried to point out significant

deviations in the past and those that are occurring in the present, with the very practical result that we may possibly utilize such deviations as they occur in the future.

TABS